UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

TERRENCE ROACH,	U.S. District Court No:			
Plaintiff,	Hon Magistrate Judge			
V.				
	Removed from			
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,	Third Circuit Court			
	Case No. 19-002372-CD			
Defendant.				

GASIOREK, MORGAN, GRECO, McCAULEY & KOTZIAN, P.C. By: David F. Greco (P53523) Attorneys for Plaintiff 30500 Northwestern Highway Suite 425 Farmington Hills, MI 48334 (248) 865-0001 dgreco@gmgmklaw.com

KIENBAUM HARDY VIVIANO
PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.
By: Elizabeth Hardy (P37426)
Sonja L. Lengnick (P67101)
Attorneys for Defendant
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Suite 400
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 645-0000
ehardy@khvpf.com
slengnick@khvpf.com

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Defendant Ford Motor Company (hereinafter "Defendant" or "Ford), by its undersigned counsel Kienbaum Hardy Viviano Pelton & Forrest, P.L.C., removes this action from the Third Circuit Court, State of Michigan, where it is now pending, to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division.

In support of its Notice of Removal, Ford states:

- 1. On February 19, 2019, Plaintiff commenced this action in Michigan's Third Circuit Court by filing a Complaint entitled *Terrence Roach v. Ford Motor Company*, docketed as case number 19-002372-CD.
- 2. Plaintiff served a Summons and a copy of the Complaint on Ford via certified mail, which was received on February 22, 2019. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), this Notice of Removal is timely, because it is filed within 30 days of Ford's acceptance of service.
- 3. The Summons and Complaint that are attached hereto as Exhibit A constitute all process, pleadings, and orders in this action to date.
- 4. This Court has original "federal question" jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because Count I of the Complaint alleges disability discrimination in violation of the American with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq., and Count III of the Complaint pleads claims under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, 29 U.S.C. § 2601, et seq., both of which arise under federal law.
- 5. Plaintiff's Complaint also pleads state law causes of action under Michigan's Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act, MCL 37.1101, et seq., and Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, MCL 37.2101, et seq. This Court has pendent or supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims because the state law claims

derive from a common nucleus of operative facts. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367; 28 U.S.C. § 1441(C); United Mine Workers v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715 (1966).

- 6. A Notice of Filing Notice of Removal and a copy of this Notice of Removal will be filed with the Clerk of the Third Circuit Court, State of Michigan, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), and copies will be served on Plaintiff as verified by the attached proof of service.
- 7. Ford is entitled to, and hereby does, remove this action to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1441.

KIENBAUM HARDY VIVIANO PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.

By: /s/ Sonja Lengnick
Elizabeth Hardy (P37426)
Sonja L. Lengnick (P67101)
Attorneys for Defendant
280 N. Old Woodward Ave., Suite 400
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
(248) 645-0000
ehardy@khvpf.com
slengnick@khvpf.com

Dated: March 22, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 22, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system and served by electronic filing with the Wayne County Circuit Court's ECF system and via email and U.S. Mail upon:

David F. Greco 30500 Northwestern Highway, Suite 425 Farmington Hills, MI 48334

/s/Sonja Lengnick

280 North Old Woodward Ave Suite 400 Birmingham, Michigan 48009 (248) 645-0000 Email: slengnick@khvpf.com (P67101)

323719

EXHIBIT A

Case 2:19-cv-10845-VAR-RSW ECF No. 1 filed 03/22/19 PageID.6 Page 6 of 15

Approved, SCAO	1st Copy- Defendant	and Copy - Plaintiff ard Copy -Return	
STATE OF MICHIGAN THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT WAYNE COUNTY	SUMMONS	CASE NO. 19-002372-CD Hon.John H. Gillis, Jr.	
Court address : 2 Woodward Ave., Detroit MI 48226	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Court telephone no.: 313-224-5243	
Plaintiff's name(s), address(es), and telephone no(s) Roach, Terrence	v	Defendant's name(s); address(es), and telephone no(s). Ford Motor Company	
Plaintiff's attorney, bar no., address, and telephone in David F. Greco 53523 30500 Northwestern Hwy Ste 425 Farmington Hills, MI 48334-3164	0		
Instructions: Check the items below that apply to your complaint and, if necessary, a case inventory a	ou and provide any require addendum (form MC 21). Ti	d information. Submit this form to the court clerk along with ne summons section will be completed by the court clerk.	
members of the person(s) who are the subject There is one or more pending or resolved case family members of the person(s) who are the s	of the complaint. es within the jurisdiction of t	y division of the circuit court involving the family or family the family division of the circuit court involving the family or ached is a completed case inventory (form MC 21) listing	
those cases. It is unknown if there are pending or resolved or family members of the person(s) who are the		of the family division of the circuit court involving the family	
complaint will be provided to MDHHS and (if a ☐ There is no other pending or resolved civil action	e a right to recover expensionally and the contracted he on arising out of the same t	es in this case, I certify that notice and a copy of the	
been previously filed in 🗆 this court, 🗀		Court,	
where it was given case number	and assigned to J	udge	
The action remains is no longer pend	ling.		
Summons section completed by court clerk.	SUMMONS		
copy on the other party or take other lawful act this state). 3. If you do not answer or take other action within complaint.	ons and a copy of the contion with the court (28 da the time allowed, judgment e court because of a disable	plaint to file a written answer with the court and serve a ys if you were served by mall or you were served outside may be entered against you for the relief demanded in the lity or if you require a foreign language interpreter to help	
Issue date 2/19/2019	Expiration date* 5/21/2019	Court clerk Tashia Marshall	
		Cathy M. Garrett- Wayne County Clerk.	

Oatry W. Garrens wayne county

*This summons is invalid unless served on or before its expiration date. This document must be sealed by the seal of the court.

MC 01 (1/19)

SUMMONS

MCR 1.109(D), MCR 2.102(B), MCR 2.104, MCR 2.105



SUMMONS Case No.: 19-002372-CD

PROOF OF SERVICE

TO PROCESS SERVER: You are to serve the summons and complaint not later than 91 days from the date of filing or the date of expiration on the order for second summons. You must make and file your return with the court clerk. If you are unable to complete service you must return this original and all copies to the court clerk.

CERTIFICATE / AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE / NONSERVICE

	OFFICER CE	RTIFIC	ATE	OR		AFFIDAVIT OF PROCESS SERVER		
I certify that I am a sheriff, deputy sheriff, balliff, appointed court officer, or attorney for a party (MCR 2.104[A][2]), and that: (notarization not required)						Being first duly sworn, I state that I am a legally competent adult who is not a party or an officer of a corporate party, and that: (notarization required)		
☐ I served person	ally a copy of the	e summor	ns and complaint.					
I served by reg			was to a second of the second			summons and complaint,		
	List all do	cuments se	rved with the Summons a	and Complai	rit			
						on the defendant(s):		
Defendant's name Complete address((es) of serv	rice	Day, dale, time			
	lly attempted to sole to complete		summons and complai	int, togethe	r with any	attachments, on the following defendant(s) and		
		Complete address	ss(es) of service		Day, dale, time			
) W. C.							
I declare under the information, knowle			his proof of service ha	s been exa	mined by r	ne and thal its contents are true to the best of my		
Service fee \$	Miles traveled \$	Fee \$	Signature					
Incorrect address fee \$	Miles traveled	Fee \$	Total fee \$	Nan	Name (type or print)			
	1*	٠		Title		the state of the s		
Subscribed and sw	orn to before me	on	Date			County, Michigan.		
My commission expires: Signature:				DIv	A-L-d-Mineral Company			
	Date				Deputy co	urt clerk/Notary public		
Notary public, State	of Michigan, Co	ounty of _	T					
			ACKNOWLED	GMENT	OF SERV	CE		
I acknowledge that	I have received	service of	the summons and cor	mplaint, tog	ether with	Attachments		
			on _			Attachments		
Signature			on b	ehalf of _				

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF WAYNE

TERRENCE ROACH.

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2019-

-CD

VS.

Honorable

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendant.

GASIOREK, MORGAN, GRECO. McCAULEY & KOTZIAN, P.C. By: David F. Greco (P53523) Attorneys for Plaintiff 30500 Northwestern Highway, Suite 425 Farmington Hills, MI 48334 (248) 865-0001 dgreco@gmgmklaw.com

> There is no other civil action between these parties arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as alleged in this Complaint.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, TERRANCE ROACH, by and through his attorneys, GASIOREK, MORGAN, GRECO, McCAULEY & KOTZIAN, P.C., and for his Complaint against the above-named Defendant, states as follows:

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff, TERRANCE ROACH, is an individual residing in the City of Belleville, Wayne County, Michigan.
- 2. Defendant, FORD MOTOR COMPANY (hereinafter "FORD"), is a Michigan corporation, with its principal place of business in the City of Dearborn, Wayne County, Michigan.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- The amount in controversy in this civil action is in excess of \$25,000, and jurisdiction is proper in this judicial circuit pursuant to MCL 600.601.
 - 4. Venue is proper in this judicial circuit pursuant to MCL 600.1621.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 5. Plaintiff became employed with Defendant, FORD, on or about January 1, 2006.
- 6. His last position of employment was as a Process Coach for Defendant, FORD, at the Dearborn Truck Plant.
- 7. Defendant, FORD, was aware of medical conditions/disabilities that Plaintiff was diagnosed with and suffered from for approximately the last six years of his employment.
- 8. As a result of those medical conditions, Plaintiff requested and was approved for a leave of absence to deal with his medical conditions.
- In August 2017 Plaintiff became sick and was diagnosed with a condition/disability
 that made it necessary for him to be on medical leave for approximately two weeks.
- 10. When Plaintiff returned to work following his leave of absence in August 2017, he was unfairly and unjustly disciplined for an incident that allegedly occurred four months earlier.
- 11. In or around the first week of January 2018, prior to starting a new shift, he had been informed by one of prior shift supervisors that two additional employees were pre-authorized to work on his shift so Plaintiff permitted it.
- 12. In or around the second week of January 2018, Plaintiff was questioned at work regarding the authorization of certain employees to work on one of his shifts during the first week of January 2018.

- 13. The following week Plaintiff suffered from another medical issue (as a result of preexisting medical conditions/disability) and was again off work for approximately one week.
- 14. Approximately two weeks after returning from that leave of absence, Plaintiff was unfairly and unjustly terminated from his employment.
- 15. On or about June 1, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).
- 16. By way of a notice dated November 21, 2018, Plaintiff obtained his Notice of Right to Sue letter from the EEOC. This action is being commenced within 90 days of such Notice of Right to Sue letter.

COUNT I VIOLATION OF THE AMERICAN'S WITH DISABILITIES ACT

- 17. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every paragraph of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 18. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was an "employee" and Defendant was an "employer" under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC §12101, et seq. ("ADA").
- 19. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was a "qualified" person with a disability, was regarded by Defendant as having a disability, and/or had a history of a disability under the ADA.
- 20. Defendant had a duty under the ADA not to discharge or otherwise discriminate against Plaintiff in his employment on account of such disability, perceived disability and/or history of disability.
- 21. Plaintiff's disability did not affect his ability to perform the essential functions of his particular job with or without reasonable accommodation.

- 22. Defendant violated Plaintiff's rights under the ADA because of his disability, perceived disability, and/or history of disability by, including, but not limited to the following:
 - a. Retaliating against Plaintiff;
 - b. Unfairly and unjustly disciplining Plaintiff;
 - c. Refusing to allow Plaintiff to return to or continue with his active employment;
 - d. Terminating Plaintiff's employment;
 - e. Limiting, segregating, or classifying Plaintiff in a way which deprived or tended to deprive him of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affected Plaintiff's status.
 - f. Otherwise discriminating against Plaintiff with respect to the terms, conditions and privileges of employment.
- 23. Defendant's violation was with malice or with reckless indifference to Plaintiff's federally protected rights.
- 24. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the ADA, Plaintiff has suffered damages, including but not limited to loss of past and future income and fringe benefits, loss of professional reputation, mental anxiety and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in his favor and against the Defendant in whatever amount is shown to be established by the proofs in this cause, together with interest, cost, and reasonable attorney fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY IS HEREBY MADE

COUNT II VIOLATION OF THE PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

25. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every paragraph of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

- 26. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was an "employee" and Defendant was an "employer" under Michigan's Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act ("PWDCRA"), MCL 37.1101 et seq.
- 27. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff suffered a disability, was regarded by Defendant as having a disability, and/or had a history of a disability under the PWDCRA.
- 28. Defendant had a duty under the PWDCRA not to discharge or otherwise discriminate against Plaintiff in his employment on account of such disability, perceived disability and/or history of disability.
- 29. Plaintiff's disability did not affect his ability to perform the essential functions of his particular job with or without reasonable accommodation.
- 30. Defendant violated Plaintiff's rights under the PWDCRA because of his disability, perceived disability, and/or history of disability by, including but not limited to:
 - a. Retaliating against Plaintiff;
 - b. Unfairly and unjustly disciplining Plaintiff;
 - c. Refusing to allow Plaintiff to return to or continue with his active employment;
 - d. Terminating Plaintiff's employment;
 - e. Limiting, segregating, or classifying Plaintiff in a way which deprived or tended to deprive him of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affected Plaintiff's status.
 - f. Otherwise discriminating against Plaintiff with respect to the terms, conditions and privileges of employment.
- 31. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violation of the PWDCRA, Plaintiff has suffered damages, including but not limited to loss of past and future income and fringe benefits, loss of professional reputation, mental anxiety and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in their favor and against the Defendant in whatever amount is shown to be established by the proofs in this cause, together with interest, cost, and reasonable attorney fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY IS HEREBY MADE

COUNT III VIOLATION OF THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

- 32. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every paragraph of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 33. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was an "employee" and Defendant was an "employer" under the Family and Medical Leave Act, 29 USC §2611, et seq. ("FMLA").
- 34. Defendant had a duty under the FMLA not to discriminate or retaliate against Plaintiff because of his exercise of rights under the FMLA.
- 35. Defendant violated Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA by, including, but not limited to the following:
 - a. Retaliating against Plaintiff;
 - b. Unfairly and unjustly disciplining Plaintiff;
 - c. Refusing to allow Plaintiff to return to or continue with his active employment;
 - d. Terminating Plaintiff's employment;
 - Limiting, segregating, or classifying Plaintiff in a way which deprived or tended to deprive him of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affected Plaintiff's status.
 - f. Otherwise discriminating against Plaintiff with respect to the terms, conditions and privileges of employment.
 - 36. Defendant's violation was willful.

37. As a direct and proximate result of such violations of Plaintiff's rights by Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered damages, including but not limited to, the loss of past and future income and employee benefits, mental anxiety, and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in their favor and against the Defendant in whatever amount is shown to be established by the proofs in this cause, together with interest, cost, and reasonable attorney fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY IS HEREBY MADE.

COUNT IV ELLIOTT-LARSEN CIVIL RIGHTS ACT – WEIGHT DISCRIMINATION

- 38. Plaintiff repeats each and every paragraph of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 39. Plaintiff is a "person" or "individual," and Defendant was an "employer" and a "person" within the meaning of the Michigan's Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act ("ELCRA"), MCL §37.2101, et seq.
- 40. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty under the ELCRA not to discharge or otherwise discriminate against Plaintiff because of his weight.
- 41. Defendant violated Plaintiff's rights under the ELCRA by, including but not limited to, the following:
 - a. Terminating Plaintiff's employment because of his weight.
 - b. Unfairly and unjustly disciplining Plaintiff;
 - c. Denying Plaintiff employment opportunities because of his weight.
 - d. Treating Plaintiff differently than similarly situated employees because of his weight.
 - e. Discriminating against Plaintiff with respect to compensation or the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

- f. Otherwise discriminating against and disparately treating Plaintiff on the basis of his weight with respect to the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment.
- 42. As a direct and proximate result of such violations of Plaintiff's rights by Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered damages, including but not limited to, the loss of past and future income and employee benefits, mental anxiety, and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in their favor and against the Defendant in whatever amount is shown to be established by the proofs in this cause, together with interest, cost, and reasonable attorney fees.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Respectfully submitted,

GASIOREK, MORGAN, GRECO, McCAULEY & KOTZIAN P.C.

BY: /s/: DAVID F. GRECO (P53523)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

30500 Northwestern Highway, Suite 425

Farmington Hills, MI 48334

(248) 865-0001

Dgreco@gmgmklaw.com

Dated: February 18, 2019